Consolidated Water Use Efficiency 2002 PSP
PART ONE

A. Project Information Form

1. Applying for (select one):

☒ (a) **Prop 13 Urban Water Conservation Capital Outlay Grant**

☐ (b) Prop 13 Agricultural Water Conservation Capital Outlay Feasibility Study Grant

☐ (c) DWR Water Use Efficiency Project

2. Principal applicant (Organization or affiliation): **Goleta Water District**

3. Project Title: **Camino Meleno Waterline Replacement Project**

4. Person authorized to sign and submit proposal:

Name, title	**Kevin Walsh** **General Manager**
Mailing address	**4699 Hollister Avenue** **Goleta, CA 93110-1999**
Telephone	**(805) 964-6761**
Fax.	**(805) 964-7002**
E-mail	**kwalsh@goletawater.com**

5. Contact person (if different):

Name, title.	**Matt van der Linden** **Civil Engineer**
Mailing address.	**4699 Hollister Avenue** **Goleta, CA 93110-1999**
Telephone	**(805) 879-4625**
Fax.	**(805) 879-4657**
E-mail	**mvanderlinden@goletawater.com**

6. Funds requested (dollar amount): **$ 136,500.00**

7. Applicant funds pledged (dollar amount): **$ 73,500.00**

8. Total project costs (dollar amount): **$ 210,00.00**

9. Estimated total quantifiable project benefits (dollar amount): **$ 258,507.00**

Percentage of benefit to be accrued by applicant: **100%**

Percentage of benefit to be accrued by CALFED or others: **0%**

Consolidated Water Use Efficiency 2002 PSP
PART ONE

A. Project Information Form (continued)

10. Estimated annual amount of water to be saved (acre-feet): **.05**

Estimated total amount of water to be saved (acre-feet): **5**

Over ___ years **100**

Estimated benefits to be realized in terms of water quality, instream flow, other: **N/A**

11. Duration of project (month/year to month/year): **9/2002 to 1/2003**

12. State Assembly District where the project is to be conducted: **35**

13. State Senate District where the project is to be conducted: **18**

14. Congressional district(s) where the project is to be conducted: **22**

15. County where the project is to be conducted: **Santa Barbara County**

16. Date most recent Urban Water Management Plan submitted to the Department of Water Resources: **August 2001**

17. Type of applicant (select one):
Prop 13 Urban Grants and Prop 13 Agricultural Feasibility Study Grants:

- ☐ (a) city
- ☐ (b) county
- ☐ (c) city and county
- ☐ (d) joint power authority
- ☒ **(e) other political subdivision of the State, including public water district**
- ☐ (f) incorporated mutual water company

DWR WUE Projects: the above entities (a) through (f) or:

- ☐ (g) investor-owned utility
- ☐ (h) non-profit organization
- ☐ (i) tribe
- ☐ (j) university
- ☐ (k) state agency
- ☐ (l) federal agency

18. Project focus:

- ☐ (a) agricultural
- ☒ **(b) urban**

Consolidated Water Use Efficiency 2002 PSP
PART ONE

A. Project Information Form (continued)

19. Project type (select one):
Prop 13 Urban Grant or Prop 13 Agricultural Feasibility Study Grant capital outlay project related to:

- ☐ (a) implementation of Urban Best Management Practices
- ☐ (b) implementation of Agricultural Efficient Water Management Practices
- ☐ (c) implementation of Quantifiable Objectives (include QO number(s)

  .....
- ☒ (d) other (specify)

  Water Use Efficiency Improvement Project

DWR WUE Project related to:

- ☐ (e) implementation of Urban Best Management Practices
- ☐ (f) implementation of Agricultural Efficient Water Management Practices
- ☐ (g) implementation of Quantifiable Objectives (include QO number(s))
- ☐ (h) innovative projects (initial investigation of new technologies, methodologies, approaches, or institutional frameworks)
- ☐ (i) research or pilot projects
- ☐ (j) education or public information programs
- ☐ (k) other (specify)

  N/A

20. Do the actions in this proposal involve physical changes in land use, or potential future changes in land use?

- ☐ (a) yes
- ☒ **(b) no**

If yes, the applicant must complete the CALFED PSP Land Use Checklist found at http://calfed.water.ca.gov/environmental_docs.html and submit it with the proposal.

Consolidated Water Use Efficiency 2002 PSP
PART ONE

B. Signature Page

By signing below, the official declares the following:

The truthfulness of all representations in the proposal;

The individual signing the form is authorized to submit the proposal on behalf of the applicant; and

The individual signing the form read and understood the conflict of interest and confidentiality section and waives any and all rights to privacy and confidentiality of the proposal on behalf of the applicant.

_____	_____	_____
Signature	Name and title	Date

PROPOSAL

FOR FUNDING OF A PROPOSITION 13 URBAN WATER CONSERVATION CAPITAL OUTLAY GRANT

FOR THE CAMINO MELENO WATERLINE REPLACEMENT PROJECT

PREPARED BY:

GOLETA WATER DISTRICT

MARCH 1, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART ONE

A. Project Information Form

B. Signature Page

PART TWO

A. Scope of Work: Relevance and Importance

1. The objectives of the Camino Meleno Waterline Replacement Project are to reduce current potable water demands and improve service reliability to Goleta Water District (GWD) customers. A primary means for achieving this is to relocate the existing, deteriorated waterline out of a hillside drainage area and into public road right-of-way. GWD serves the new city of Goleta and unincorporated areas of southern Santa Barbara County, and is located along the coast just west of the city of Santa Barbara. Camino Meleno is a street in the suburban foothills in the unincorporated area of the District. The existing waterline directly services 33 homes and three fire hydrants. The replacement waterline will run approximately 1,400 feet, serve these same homes and hydrants, and improve service reliability to an additional 7 homes and another fire hydrant. Homes in this neighborhood range in value from $600,000 to $2 million, which have experienced repeated service interruptions due to local waterline failures. The project will involve trenching and installing a new 8" PVC water main and appurtenances.

2. Santa Barbara County has a history of difficulty in obtaining adequate water supply for its constituents. From 1972 to 1996 the GWD Board of Directors imposed a moratorium on new service installations because of concern over inadequate supply. Eventually conservation measures were put into effect, including a recycled water distribution network. GWD then contracted with the State of California and began receiving State water in 1997 through the Coastal Branch of the State Water Project.

   In 1999 the District began to study the condition and vulnerability of its existing facilities. The study also evaluated water supply upgrades, combined with identified water consumption savings required to meet future demand. Completed in May, 2001, the report recommended replacement and/or upgrade of many facilities, including particular distribution pipelines, and provided a 20-year capital improvement plan. An evaluation matrix was developed to objectively prioritize pipeline replacements as money became available. The pipeline evaluation criteria included leak history, adequacy of capacity, material, age, fire protection, and others. With leakage weighted as one of the most critical factors, the proposed Camino Meleno project ranked first priority among 22 other pipeline replacement needs. This project is thus an integral part of the District water management plan. Water conserved with the proposed project will reduce the Districts dependence on Bay-Delta water supplies.

B. Technical/Scientific Merit, Feasibility, Monitoring and Assessment

1. *Technical Merit and Feasibility*: The proposed project envisions trenching within the street right-of-way, and installing a new 8" PVC waterline. This is the most

common method of constructing or replacing water pipelines. It has been used for over a century and involves no significant technical challenges. Two alternative methods were considered, both of which involve a renovation technique whereby the existing pipe is used to host, or assist in installing, a new pipe or pipe lining:

a. Lining - This is the insertion of a new, fully structural polyethylene pipe inside the existing pipeline. The method is considered non-feasible because it would too severely degrade the hydraulic capacity of the system.

b. Pipe Bursting - This uses a reciprocating chisel pushed into the existing pipe to expand the diameter while destroying it, and concurrently pulling through a new, fully structural polyethylene pipe. This method was found to be technically feasible but the cost savings did not outweigh the disadvantages associated with leaving the waterline in its present location.

The selected "trench" method is thus found to possess technical merit and to be the most feasible based on both cost and serviceability.

2. *Task List and Schedule:* Table 1 below provides a time and cost schedule of the tasks required to accomplish the proposed project. It is assumed due to the relatively straight forward nature of our proposed project that if we are awarded grant funding, a contract can be successfully negotiated with DWR and executed by August 23, 2002. The project deliverables (work products) consist of: 1) final plans, specifications, and cost estimates, and 2) the constructed facilities to replace and relocate approximately 1,460 linear feet of waterline.

   The majority of the District's request for grant funding is for construction costs. Construction of the proposed project will be completed within a three month period, therefore expenditure of most of the requested grant funds ($210,000) will occur over this same three month period. If awarded grant funding on this project the District proposes to front the construction costs and submit only one request for reimbursement after completion of construction.

   None of the project tasks are separable. If only a portion of the project were to be funded, the project would be constructed in portions by laying only the length of pipe for which funds are available. If the full pipe length were not constructed, a second mobilization cost would be incurred.

3. *Monitoring and Assessment*: GWD will evaluate the project's success in conserving water and improving service reliability by the following methods:

   a. There have been eight breaks in the portion of pipeline to be relocated. It is estimated 72,000 gallons of water has been lost due to these breaks during a 5-year period, or about 14,400 gal/yr. Water loss due to main breaks will be

monitored after the replacement project has been completed, and compared to this loss rate to assess the quantity of water being saved.

b. GWD has recent and historic fire flow test data for the fire hydrants at the upper end of the network served by the waterline to be replaced. After completion of the proposed project, subsequent tests will be performed to provide measurement of improvement in water pressure and fire flow.

c. GWD maintains records of problems and complaints associated with our entire network, including the waterline proposed for replacement. These records include communications from customers and service records of work performed by GWD to repair main breaks and perform required maintenance. Table 2 below lists these incidents. GWD intends to monitor the same customers and performance of the proposed new waterline to assess how successful the project has improved service reliability and reduced customer inconvenience.

Table 2
History of Problems from the Camino Meleno Waterline

Date	Street No.	Description of Complaint and/or Repair	Appx. Cost
1994		Repaired main break	$8,700
11/05/95	1358	Pressure loss – house call only	$100
1995		Repaired main break	$8,700
1/05/96	1395	Pressure too high – house call only	$100
1996		Repaired main break	$8,700
2/04/96	1457	Pressure loss – inspection performed	$120
1996		Repaired main break	$8,700
1996		Repaired main break	$8,700
4/21/97	1214	Overhauled CLA-Valve	$500
1997		Repaired main break	$8,700
1/05/99	1421	Pressure loss for weeks – house call only	$100
1999		Repaired main break	$8,700
7/26/99	1457	Fluctuating pressure – inspection performed	$150
1999		Repaired main break	$8,700
		TOTAL:	**$70,670**

Appendix A provides the Monitoring and Assessment Report GWD will use for monitoring the success of the proposed waterline replacement project. This report will be submitted to DWR if requested. Each of the parameters discussed above are shown in the report with their current value. Over the course of the first

year after completion of the project, new values will be measured and recorded in the report. This will complete the monitoring program established for this project.

4. *Preliminary Plans and Specifications*: Construction plans and specifications are under development and are at the 50% complete stage as of the date of this application. Drawings showing the proposed horizontal layout, along with draft specifications, are provided as Appendix B. A single set of plans and specifications has been prepared that combines this project and the Districts proposed Large Meter Replacement Project. Bid items for the two projects will be carefully separated to accurately account for the costs of each project individually. The Engineers Certification Statement is provided in Appendix C.

C. Qualifications of the Applicant

With the exception of the topographic surveying, all of the engineering, construction management, and inspection work for the proposed project will be performed by District staff. The topographic surveying for the project was completed by a surveying consultant. The Districts Project Manager for the proposed project has successfully completed over 50 pipeline projects. The Project Manager and Project Engineer have over 35 years of combined civil engineering experience. Resumes of the Districts Project Manager and Project Engineer have been included in Appendix D. The only external cooperator that will be used for this project is the contractor to be hired to construct the project.

D. Benefits and Costs

1. *Budget Breakdown and Justification.* A Construction Cost Estimate and Total Project Cost Estimate are provide in Tables 3 and 4 below. The Total Project Cost is estimated at $210,000.

2. *Cost-Sharing.* The Goleta Water District proposes a 35% and 65% cost sharing arrangement between District funds and DWR Proposition 13 grant funds respectively. Therefore with a Total Project Cost of $210,000, the District proposes to contribute $73,500.

3. *Benefits Summary and Breakdown.* The proposed waterline improvements have the following associated benefits:

   a. *Water Conservation:* The proposed waterline replacement will eliminate current leakage and catastrophic water losses due to main breaks. An estimated 14,400 gallons (19.3 HCF) per year will be saved. Using GWD's current urban water rate of $3.29 per HCF yields a cost savings of $64/yr.

   b. *Emergency Repair:* The existing waterline has broken and required emergency repairs eight times in the last 5 years. As shown in Table 2, these

repairs have been estimated at $8,700 per occurrence. Replacement of the waterline will result in a cost savings of $13,920 per year on average.

c. *Maintenance Cost Savings:* Maintenance costs associated with the existing waterline are abnormally high for the following reasons:

- the poor condition of the existing waterline,
- it's susceptibility to breaks due to wetting of the expansive soils in which its buried, and
- the difficult access (landscaped, no roadway) to the waterline area.

Maintenance costs will be reduced significantly by replacing the waterline and relocating it to public road right-of-way. Using Table 2 above, the maintenance savings are estimated to be about $570 per year.

d. *Contingent Property Damage:* As discussed earlier, the existing waterline runs adjacent to a creek drainage area within a private property easement. When main breaks occur there is a potential for damage to private property due to flooding. After a recent break on the subject pipeline, a nearby customer blamed the occurrence for lifting their empty swimming pool 3' out of the ground. Though it was determined that GWD was not responsible for this, the damage cost in this case could have been around $50,000. For purposes of valuating this benefit, damages of $500/yr are estimated. This is a cost that will be avoided with the replacement and relocation of the waterline.

e. *Reliability and Customer Service Improvement:* Water service has been interrupted over a dozen times due to the poor condition of the existing facility, mostly from breaks in the waterline. The direct costs to individual customers can be very large, but are indeterminate. These costs and the inconvenience of service disruptions will be eliminated with the replacement of the waterline.

f. *Public Relations Improvement*: Service interruption always degrades public relations. The excessive problems from the poor condition of the existing pipeline have been particularly frustrating to customers. The monetary value of good public relations is substantial, and includes customer resistance to necessary rate increases when relations suffer. An estimate of this value is difficult to quantify, but considering extra staff time alone, the Districts cost savings has been estimated at $500 /yr.

g. *Water Quality Improvement:* Water quality will be improved in the long term, and potentially near term also. While minimum standards are currently being met, it is anticipated that a new PVC line will produce immediate improvement in taste to the impacted customers. With the new waterline there will be less chance of leaks and breaks resulting in less chance of subsequent water

quality problems they cause, such as discolored, stirred-up sediment containing water and possible contamination. Though significant, the value of this benefit cannot be determined practically.

h. *Environmental Disturbance:* The current pipeline runs adjacent to a creek drainage area that supports trees, shrubbery and associated wildlife. Whenever a repair of the line is required, this area is disturbed and some environmental quality is disrupted. Even though it is not a protected area and the disturbance is minimal and temporary, relocating the waterline to within the existing street right-of-way will eliminate this problem. For purposes of this grant application it is not feasible to try to determine a cost associated with the environmental benefit.

i. *CALFED Goals:* Water conserved with the proposed project will reduce the Districts dependence on Bay-Delta water supplies.

The sum of the benefits listed above, where a monetary value has been determined and underlined, is approximately $15,554. This is a minimum benefit value, and when indeterminate values are added, the benefit of the proposed project becomes substantially greater. The benefit values are summarized in Table 5 below.

4. *Assessments of Costs and Benefits.* The assessment of costs and benefits is performed using a discount rate of 6% and a 100-year design life for the proposed waterline. The present worth is **$258,507** for the project benefits and **$210,000** for the project cost. The Benefit/Cost Ratio is **1.23**, which is greater than unity, and the project is thus found to be economically justified. The detailed Benefit/Cost Analysis as well as related information are provide in Table 5 below.

E. Outreach, Community Involvement and Acceptance

In an effort to communicate with and involve the community in the proposed project the Goleta Water District has identified and distributed an informational letter to all properties and individuals that may be affected by the project. A copy of the informational letter is included in Appendix E. The District also distributes a quarterly news letter to all of our customers briefing them on the Districts current and upcoming capital projects. Approximately two weeks prior to the start of construction, a follow up letter will be sent to all affected individuals informing them of the dates of construction and providing them with contact information for the District inspector should they have questions or concerns.

The District has received several letters of support for the proposed project that are also included in Appendix E. The District is not aware of any opposition to the proposed project.

Due to the distance of Goleta from any major metropolitan area, contractors, sub-contractors, and materials suppliers working on District projects are typically local companies. Based upon our past experience constructing similar projects, it is estimated that eight (8) local companies will receive economic benefit from the construction of the proposed project as follows: 1 prime contractor, 2 sub-contractors, 3 building materials suppliers, and 2 waterworks materials suppliers. It is estimated that the proposed project will provide full time employment for six (6) people and part time employment (10%-25%) for an additional six (6) people for the duration of construction estimated at three months.

PART THREE

A. Matching Funds Commitment Letter

The Goleta Water District's General Manager has committed the District to contribute matching funds equal to 35% of the total project cost. A signed copy of this commitment letter is provided is Appendix F.

B. Resolution

A draft resolution is included in Appendix G. Should the Goleta Water District be awarded grant funding, this resolution will be adopted by the District Board and provided to DWR prior to execution of a contract with DWR.

C. Environmental Documentation

The proposed Camino Meleno Waterline Replacement Project is a Categorically Exempt project. Please see the CEQA Notice of Exemption included in Appendix H. As a further measure, the Goleta Water District conducted a review of a CEQA Initial Study Checklist and has determined the proposed project will have no significant impacts.

The only permit required for the proposed project is a County of Santa Barbara Encroachment Permit. This is a routine construction permit and will be obtained by the Goleta Water District prior to the start of any construction on this project.

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

Engineering Feasibility Statement

I, Matthew J. van der Linden, a California registered civil engineer, have reviewed the information presented in support of this application. Based on this information, and any other knowledge I have regarding the proposed project, I find that it can be designed, constructed, and operated to accomplish the purpose for which it is planned. The information I have reviewed to document this statement includes the following: field visit to site(s), recent GWD studies and reports, GWD record drawings, public utility record maps, manufacturers literature on meters and waterline appurtenances, preliminary construction drawings, preliminary specifications, and engineers cost estimates.

_____

Signature

Camino Meleno Waterline Replacement Project
Goleta Water District Project No. 01-3366

Monitored Benefits - First Year Results
(Monitoring and Assessment Report)

Item No.	Performance Measurement	Units	Pre-Project Value	Post-Project Value *	Measured Change	% Improvement
1	Water Loss	gallons/year	14,400			
2	Fire Flow	gpm@20psi				
3	Number of Customer Complaints	per year	4			
4	Maintenance Costs	$/year	570			
5	Emergency Repair Costs	$/year	13,920			

* From 2/2003 to 2/2004

Table 4
Project Cost Estimate Summary
Camino Meleno Waterline Replacement Project
Goleta Water District Project No. 01-3366

Item No.	Description	Total		Comments
a.	Land Purchase/Easement	$ -		NA
b.	Planning/Design/Engineering	$ 15,925		Includes topographic Surveying
c.	Materials/Installation	$ -		See Item g below
d.	Structures	$ -		NA
e.	Equipment Purchases/Rentals	$ -		See Item g below
f.	Environmental Mitigation/Enhancement	$ -		NA
g.	Construction/Administration/Overhead	$ 174,930		Includes construction & contractors overhead
h.	Project/Legal/License Fees	$ -		NA
I.	Contingency (+/-10%)	$ 19,145		Constr. Admin., testing, inspection & contingency
j.	Other	$ -		
	Total Project Cost:	**$ 210,000**		

Table 3
Construction Cost Estimate
Camino Meleno Waterline Replacement Project
Goleta Water District Project No. 01-3366

Item No.	Quantity	Units	Description	Unit Price	Total
1	1	LS	Perform mobilization	$ 3,000.00	$ 3,000.00
2	1	LS	Provide traffic control	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00
3	1	EA	Hot-tap exist. 12” waterline	$ 4,500.00	$ 4,500.00
4	1	EA	Install cut-in connection to exist. 8” waterline	$ 4,000.00	$ 4,000.00
5	1,460	LF	Install 8” C900 PVC, Class 200	$ 78.00	$ 113,880.00
6	3	EA	Install 8” gate valve	$ 850.00	$ 2,550.00
7	1	EA	Install 1" combination air valve	$ 2,500.00	$ 2,500.00
8	1	EA	Install 4" blow-off assembly	$ 3,000.00	$ 3,000.00
9	1	EA	Install 1” stub service / angle ball meter valve	$ 1,200.00	$ 1,200.00
10	1	LS	Install on-site service line	$ 1,000.00	$ 1,000.00
11	1	LS	Cut exist. 8" stl. waterline and install blind flange	$ 1,500.00	$ 1,500.00
12	1	LS	Remove exist. valve cans and abandon exist. Waterlines	$ 1,500.00	$ 1,500.00
13	191	TON	Construct 4” AC pavement	$ 135.00	$ 25,785.00
14	8,030	SF	Construct Type II Slurry Seal per Santa Barbara County Stds.	$ 0.50	$ 4,015.00
15	1	EA	Remodel exist. sewer lateral	$ 1,500.00	$ 1,500.00
			Total Construction Cost:		**$ 174,930.00**

Table 5
Project Cost/Benefit Analysis
Camino Meleno Waterline Replacement Project
Goleta Water District Project No. 01-3366

Note: Project benefits are defined in terms of avoided costs.

Item No.	Description	Avoided Annual Costs	Comments
1	Operations *	$ -	*
2	Water Loss	$ 64	
3	Emergency Repairs	$ 13,920	
4	Regular Maintenance	$ 570	
5	Private Party Damage Reimbursement	$ 500	
6	Reliability and Customer Service Improvement	$ -	**
7	Public Relations Improvement	$ 500	
8	Water Quality Improvement	$ -	**
9	Avoided Environmental Disturbance	$ -	**
	Total Avoided Annual Costs:	$ 15,554	
	Total Discounted O&M Cost:	**$ 258,507**	Based on design life of 100 years

* Operations costs are considered to be the same with or without the replacement project and are therefore not considered.
** Non-Quantifiable Benefit

Project Cost/Benefit Analysis

Total Discounted Project Benefit ($)	$ 258,507
Total Discounted Project Cost ($)	$ 210,000
Benefit/Cost Ratio	**1.23**

Table 1

Task List and Schedule

Camino Meleno Waterline Replacement Project

Goleta Water District Project No. 01-3366

Item No.	Task	Start Date	Complete Date	Estimated Cost
1	Planning	Completed 7/15/01		*
2	Environmental Documentation	Completed 11/26/01		*
3	Research & Data Collection	Completed 12/23/01		*
4	Preliminary Engineering	Completed 2/27/02		$ 15,925
5	Final Design	03-Apr-02	17-May-02	*
6	Bidding	05-Aug-02	23-Aug-02	*
7	Construction (plus contingency)	16-Sep-02	20-Dec-02	$ 194,075
8	Monitoring (0 to 6 months)	01-Feb-03	1-Aug-03	*
9	Monitoring (7 to 12 months)	02-Aug-03	31-Jan-04	*
10	Annual Report	22-Dec-03	28-Feb-04	*
	Total Project Cost:			**$210,000**

* Indicates all work performed by in-house GWD staff.

RESOLUTION NO. 2002-

GOLETA WATER DISTRICT

A RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT PROPOSITION 13 URBAN WATER CONSERVATION CAPITAL OUTLAY GRANT FUNDS AND DESIGNATE AN AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE TO EXECUTE THE CONTRACT AND SIGN REQUESTS FOR DISBURSEMENT

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLETA WATER DISTRICT AS FOLLOWS:

1. On March 1, 2002, the Goleta Water District submitted a proposal to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) for funding of the District's proposed Camino Meleno Waterline Replacement Project. The proposal requested a Capital Outlay Grant under the Proposition 13 Urban Water Conservation Program.

2. On [date], DWR approved funding to the District of a Capital Outlay Grant under the above stated Program for the District's Camino Meleno Waterline Replacement Project.

3. The District hereby accepts the Proposition 13 Urban Water Conservation Capital Outlay Grant and designates Kevin D. Walsh, General Manager as its authorized representative to execute the contract and sign requests for disbursement.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Directors this ____ day of _____, 2002 on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Directors

Nay:

Abstain:

Absent:

ATTEST:

_____ _____

MARIE E. ZEMAN, DISTRICT SECRETARY LARRY MILLS, PRESIDENT

February 25, 2002

California Department of Water Resources
Office of Water Use Efficiency
P.O. Box 942836, Sacramento, CA 94236-0001
Attention: Marsha Prillwitz

Subject: Proposal for Proposition 13 Urban Water Conservation Capital Outlay Grant
Camino Meleno Waterline Replacement Project
Commitment of Matching Funds

Dear Ms. Prillwitz:

The Goleta Water District is pleased to submit a proposal for the Proposition 13 Urban Water Conservation Capital Outlay Grant. We believe we have a strong candidate for the grant. Our proposed project replaces over a thousand feet of a deteriorated pipeline that ruptures frequently causing substantial water losses, public inconvenience and high maintenance costs. The estimated cost to replace the line is $210,000, and the estimated benefit-cost ratio is 1.23.

By this letter the Goleta Water District hereby commits to funding 35% ($73,500) of the total cost of the proposed project.

Please contact me at (805) 879-4621 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Goleta Water District

Kevin D. Walsh
General Manager

GRADY W. WILLIAMS, P.E.
Project Engineer

PROFESSIONAL SUMMARY

- 21 Years of Civil Engineering Experience
- 14 Years of Project Management Experience
- 10 Years of Public Works and Municipal Engineering Experience
- 11 Years of Private Consulting Experience
- Designed Several Pipelines for the Goleta Water District
- Inspected Construction of Over 30 Water Distribution Projects

RELATED PROJECT EXPERIENCE

Owner, Project and Location	Position	Responsibilities
Goleta Water District, Waterline Replacement 2001 and 2002, Goleta, CA	Project Engineer and Construction Inspector	Designed water distribution facilities; performed design calculations, prepared drawings, and wrote specifications. Performed construction inspection including pressure tests, bacteriological tests, change order evaluation, event scheduling, shop drawing and submittals tracking and review, invoice review and approval.
Goleta Water District, Polybutylene Service Replacement, Goleta, CA	Project Engineer	Designed water distribution facilities; prepared drawings and wrote specifications
Goleta Water District, Fire Hydrant Relocation, Goleta, CA	Project Engineer	Performed planning, design, and construction inspection
Goleta Water District, Fire Line and Domestic Water Service Installation, Goleta, CA	Project Engineer	Performed plan check of developer design calculations and drawings. Inspected construction, pressure tests and bacteriological tests.
Camp Dresser and McKee, Water Supply System Assessment and Upgrade, US Army Community, Stuttgart, Germany	Project Manager	Performed system analysis and determined upgrade requirements for 62,500 ft distribution network. Reviewed current demand and estimated future demand requirements. Performed leak detection, analyzed pipeline coupons and performed pressure and other tests to evaluate system

		life and replacement requirements. Established data base and GIS mapping to organize and evaluate all data. Developed preliminary designs and cost estimates.
Woodward-Clyde Consultants, Water Conservation Plan, US Navy Community, Sigonella, Sicily	Project Manager and Project Engineer	Inspected the water supply and distribution facilities for a community of 50,000 inhabitants. Developed preliminary designs to increase the capacity of groundwater extraction, and to upgrade the distribution network, including pipeline replacement. Developed a community-wide plan for reducing potable water consumption.
Corps of Engineers, Construction of Irrigation Aqueduct, North-east Idaho	Inspector	Performed inspection of construction of a 5-foot diameter conduit for conveying irrigation water.

PERSONAL DATA

Education

• Master of Science	Geotechnical Engineering, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA, 1987
• Bachelor of Science	Civil Engineering, Walla Walla College, WA, 1981

Professional Registration Washington, RCE No. 22943

Affiliations

- American Water Works Association
- American Society of Civil Engineers

Continuing Education

- Rehabilitation of the Pressure Pipe Network – ASCE, 2002
- CADD 2002 – Lackner, 2001
- Specifications Writing Workshop – COE
- Contract Negotiations – COE, 1994
- Value Engineering – US Navy, 1995
- Project Management – CDM, 1996

MATTHEW J. VAN DER LINDEN, P.E.
Project Manager

PROFESSIONAL SUMMARY

- 16 Years of Civil Engineering Experience
- 12 Years of Project Management Experience
- Municipal Engineering and Private Consulting Experience
- Well Rounded Planning, Design, and Construction Experience
- Provided Consulting Services to Over 25 Water Utilities
- Designed or Managed Over 50 Pipeline Projects

RELATED PROJECT EXPERIENCE

Project, and Location	Position	Responsibilities
Goleta Water District, Waterline Replacement Projects, Goleta, CA	Project Manager	Manage the planning, design and construction of annual waterline replacement projects throughout Goleta including associated meter replacements.
Southern California Water Company, Large Meter Replacement Program, Los Angeles, CA	Project Engineer	Prepared plans for the replacement of fifty-eight 3- through 10-inch turbine, compound and fireline meters. Performed detailed field evaluation of each meter, as well as flow rate calculations and design of new meter setting.
City Waterline Replacement Project 1993-94, Bell Gardens, CA	Project Engineer	Prepared plans and specifications for the replacement of 5,400 linear feet of 8- and 12-inch PVC pipe, including replacement of existing services and meters.
City Waterline Replacement Project 1992-93, Paramount, CA	Project Engineer	Prepared plans and specifications for the replacement of 8,000 linear feet of 8-inch PVC pipe, including replacement of existing services and meters.
City of Lakewood/City of Cerritos, Water System Emergency Interconnect, Lakewood/Cerritos, CA	Project Engineer	Prepared plans and specifications for a 6,500 gpm emergency interconnect between the water systems of the City of Lakewood and City of Cerritos. The interconnect included a 16-inch bi-directional propeller meter and a 16-inch pressure reducing/ pressure sustaining

Project, and Location	Position	Responsibilities
		valve.
EVMWD, Bundy Canyon Road Transmission Pipeline, Lake Elsinore, CA	Project Engineer	Prepared improvement plans for 3,800 linear feet of 24-inch PVC waterline in Bundy Canyon Road. The waterline was designed to connect the existing Farm Booster Pumping Station with the existing transmission main in Mission Trail.
CBMWD, RP-4 Outfall and Re-claimed Water Distribution System Projects, Ontario/Rancho Cucamonga, CA	Project Engineer	Assisted with planning and construction management of 44,000 feet of 36--inch and 42-inch diameter steel reclaimed waterline. Prepared Preliminary Design Reports for a 12 mgd and 20 mgd pump station, and a 2.2 MG cast-in-place concrete reservoir and chlorination facilities.
City of Artesia, Water System Master Plan, Artesia, CA	Project Engineer	Performed computer model of the water system. Calculated future system demands, and developed capital improvement program for replacement of old and undersized mains, and upgrade of the supply and distribution system.

PERSONAL DATA

Education: B.S. Civil Engineering, California State University, Long Beach, 1986

Professional Registrations: California, RCE No. 46295; Nevada, RCE No. 10749, The California Community Colleges, Limited Service Teaching Credential in Engineering

Publications: "Implementing a Large Meter Replacement Program," Journal AWWA, August 1998

Affiliations: American Water Works Association; American Society of Civil Engineers

Continuing Education:
Rehabilitation of the Pressure Pipe Network - ASCE
Standardized Emergency Management System – State OES
Writing Specifications and Special Provisions – UC Berkeley
Avoiding Construction Claims & Cost Overruns - CMD&T
Waterwell Design and Construction - AWWA
Urban Irrigation and Reclaimed Wastewater – UC Riverside

Wastewater Pipelines-Design Life Seminar - ACPA